

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Middlesex, SS.

Board of Registration in Medicine

Adjudicatory Case No. 2020-052

DALA Docket No. RM-20-0619

In the Matter of

ANILKUMAR KATTA, M.D.

STIPULATION

Anilkumar Katta, M.D. (Respondent), the Respondent's attorney, and Complaint Counsel agree that this Stipulation shall be filed with the Administrative Magistrate for the Division of Administrative Law Appeals (DALA) as a resolution of questions of material fact and law as set forth in the Statement of Allegations in the above captioned matter. The Respondent admits to the Findings of Fact described below and agrees that the Administrative Magistrate and the Board of Registration in Medicine (Board) may make the Conclusions of Law as set forth below.

BACKGROUND

1. The Respondent was born on May 14, 1981. He graduated from the Kurnool Medical College, NTR University of Health Sciences in India. He is certified by the American Board of Allergy and Immunology in Allergy and Immunology, by the American Board of Internal Medicine in Internal Medicine, and by the American Board of Pediatrics in Pediatrics. He has been licensed to practice medicine in Massachusetts under certificate number 260959 since June 25, 2014.

STIPULATED FACTS

2. On February 12, 2018, the Respondent was charged in Concord District Court with two counts of Assault and Battery on a Household/Family Member. Both counts related to a physical domestic dispute that the Respondent had with his wife.

3. On December 12, 2019, after a second trial, a jury convicted the Respondent on one count of Assault and Battery on a Household/Family Member, based on allegations that he grabbed his wife by the arm, pulled her out of bed and into the hallway. The same jury acquitted the Respondent of the second count of Assault and Battery on his wife.

4. On May 10, 2021 the Massachusetts Appeals Court affirmed Mr. Katta's criminal conviction in an unpublished decision, pursuant to Mass. R. App. P. 23.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. The Respondent has violated 243 CMR 1.03(5)(a)7 in that he has been convicted of a crime.

B. The Respondent has engaged in conduct that undermines the public confidence in the integrity of the medical profession. *See Levy v. Board of Registration in Medicine*, 378 Mass. 519 (1979); *Raymond v. Board of Registration in Medicine*, 387 Mass. 708 (1982).

SANCTION

The Respondent, the Respondent's attorney and Complaint Counsel expressly acknowledge that the Board may impose sanctions against the Respondent based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. The Respondent, the Respondent's attorney and Complaint Counsel jointly agree to recommend to the Board that it impose the sanction set forth below. The parties hereto understand that the recommended sanction is not binding on the Board, and that the Board may wish to impose a different sanction on the Respondent.

At the time the Board considers this Stipulation, it will inform the parties of its inclination as to sanction. If the Board's sanction is different from the one recommended by the parties, the Respondent will be given an opportunity to either accept or reject the proposed sanction. If the Respondent rejects the proposed sanction, then the matter will continue through the adjudicatory process pursuant to General Laws chapter 30A and 801 CMR 1.00 *et seq.*

The parties jointly agree to recommend to the Board that the Respondent be reprimanded.

EXECUTION OF THIS STIPULATION

The parties agree that the approval of this Stipulation is left to the discretion of the Administrative Magistrate and the Board. As to any matter this Stipulation leaves to the discretion of the Administrative Magistrate or the Board, neither the Respondent, nor anyone else acting on his behalf has received any promises or representations regarding the same.

The signature of the Respondent, his attorney, and Complaint Counsel are expressly conditioned on the Administrative Magistrate and the Board accepting this Stipulation.

If the Administrative Magistrate rejects any provision contained in this Stipulation, the entire document shall be null and void and the matter will be scheduled for a hearing pursuant to General Laws c. 30A and 801 CMR 1.00 *et seq.*

If the Board rejects any provision in this Stipulation or modifies the Sanction and said modification is rejected by the Respondent, the entire document shall be null and void and the matter will be recommitted to the Division of Administrative Law Appeals for a hearing pursuant to General Laws c. 30A and 801 CMR 1.00 *et seq.*

Neither of the parties nor anyone else may rely on the Stipulation in these proceedings or in any appeal there from.

Anilkumar Katta

Anilkumar Katta, M.D.
Respondent

August 5, 2021

Date

Chauncey B. Wood

Chauncey B. Wood, Esq.
Attorney for Respondent

August 5, 2021

Date

Karen Robinson

Karen Robinson, Esq.
Complaint Counsel

August 5, 2021

Date